LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT, U. S.

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
MAY 8 1971
E. ROBERT SEAVER, CLERK

No. 1368

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

ON APPEAL FROM THE COURT OF APPEALS,
LOGAN COUNTY, OHIO, AND
THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

HAROLD C. FOREMAN, APPELLANT
V.
CITY OF BELLEFONTAINE, et al., APPELLEES

PETITION FOR REHEARING

HAROLD C. FOREMAN,
124 EAST SPRING AVE.,
BELLEFONTAINE, OHIO 43311
APPELLANT, IN PROPRIA PERSONA

RONALD E. HADLEY,
128 NORTH MAIN ST.,
BELLEFONTAINE, OHIO 43311
ATTORNEY FOR CITY OF BELLEFONTAINE.

WILLIAM J. BROWN
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF OHIO,
STATE CAPITOL ANNEX,
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43215
AMICUS CURIAE AND ATTORNEY FOR
COURT OF APPEALS, et al.

No. 1368

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OCTOBER TERM, 1970

HAROLD C. FOREMAN, APPELLANT,
V.
THE CITY OF BELLEFONTAINE, OHIO,
AND
WILLIAM B. SAXBE, ATTORNEY GENERAL
OF OHIO, APPELLEES

ON APPEAL FROM THE COURT OF APPEALS,
THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT,
LOGAN COUNTY, OHIO

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Petitioner prays that this Court grant rehearing of its order of April 19, 1971, dismissing the appeal for want of jurisdiction, and denying certiorari, and that the Court review the judgment of the Court of Appeals, Logan County, Ohio, and the judgment of the Supreme Court of Ohio in the above entitled case as prayed for in the Jurisdictional Statement filed February 19, 1971, herein.

REASONS FOR GRANTING REHEARING

1. The substantial Constitutional questions were created, and arose, by, and under, the corrupt judges of the Court of Appeals, Logan County, Ohio, (see page A-33 of the Jurisdictional Statement, second paragraph, which conclusively shows the judges resorted to fraud and deceit to support their reversal of the trial court decision) Article 14, Section 14.01, of the Zoning Ordinance No. 2493 which incorporates and makes a

part of the Ordinance the Zoning Map (see plaintiff's Exhibit 18, page 148 of the Bill of Exceptions, a certified copy of the Ordinance No. 2493) was before the trial court in case No. 26270, and in every stage of the appeals, which clearly shows the issue and applicable laws was ignored by the courts.

2. In case No. 28885 the trial court declared Ordinance No. 2493 invalid because of the applicable laws, the decisions in the States of Alabama, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Pennsylvania, Tennesee, Illinois and Nebraska, and of course the decision in Ohio by two of the same judges that ignored the same issues that were previously before them. (see pages D-54 to D-62 of the Jurisdictional Statement)

3. The actions of the Courts of Ohio is repugnant to the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States as they willfully and knowingly deny this appellant property without due process of law and equal protection of the laws.

4. The appellees herein have confiscated appellant's private property for public use without compensation therefor by installing thereon highway and street signs, telephone poles and wires, electric power poles and wires, guy wires and buried anchors all in contravention to the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

5. The question of a conflict of decisions by two Ohio Courts of Appeals, and involving two Judges of the same Court of Appeals, the same issues, the same laws remains one of large practical importance in the administration of "equal protection of the laws". This Constitutional issue was before the Ohio Supreme Court where a decision could have been had but, the

Court chose to ignore it and unless that conflict is resolved, an unjustifiable discrimination between persons in different jurisdictions will result. (see pages D-54 to D-62 of the Jurisdictional Statement) Further, if the Judges and Courts have an unwritten law that a layman who is not represented by a member of the Bar Association shall not receive justice under our laws, is enforced, that fact should be made a part of the decision and the record.

6. Jurisdiction is conferred upon this Court by USC 28; 1257 (2). The Supreme Court of Ohio, by its silence approves the double standard of justice applied by the Courts of Appeals, which is repugnant to the Constitution of the United States.

Article III, Section 2-I, of the Constitution of the United States is mandatory that this Court accept jurisdiction of the Constitutional issues herein presented.

7. Quare: What are we fighting for in Viet Nam; to impose our corrupt system of justice on the Communists? We hope they continue to resist this.

8. I do not agree with Mrs. Martha Mitchell "that the Supreme Court of the United States should be abolished", I agree with the millions of citizens who advocate that the members of the Court should be impeached and reputable laymen appointed in the places. History shows that this Court seldom changes its decision, even when it is fully aware of being wrong, therefore, as this petition completes the record in this Court, I will dedicate my life to presenting this record to every layman member of Congress, every United States citizen, every foreign Government, and every citizen of the world, with a view towards bringing on the impeachment of the members of this Court.

9. Conclusion: I shall pray each and every day that

the wrath of God will fall upon the members of this Court.

Harold C. Foreman,
124 East Spring Ave.,
Bellefontaine, Ohio
In propria persona

Ronald E. Hadley,
City Solicitor,
128 North Main St.,
Bellefontaine, Ohio
Attorney for Appellees

William J. Brown,
Attorney General of Ohio,
State Capitol Annex,
Columbus, Ohio
a defendant and attorney for
Court of Appeals, et al.

CERTIFICATE OF APPELLANT

I hereby certify that the foregoing petition for rehearing is presented in good faith, and not for delay and is restricted to the grounds specified in Rule 58 of the Rules of this Court.

Harold C. Foreman,
Appellant in propria persona.